

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Linden1970>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
AFFECTIVE TIES AND DELINQUENCY

by



ERIC WILLIAM LINDEN

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1970

Thesis
1970 F
165

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Affective Ties and Delinquency" submitted by Eric William Linden in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Date

Sept 28 1970

ABSTRACT

This study examined a delinquency theory based on the affective ties of a boy to his parents and to both deviant and conventional peers. A predictive model was developed which included the following variables: the preferences of each of a boy's associates; the closeness of a boy to each of his associates; the visibility of a boy's actions to each of his associates; and the responsiveness to his actions of each of his associates. If a particular associate is very close, very likely to know of the boy's behavior, and very likely to change his opinion about the boy on the basis of this knowledge, then that associate would have maximum influence on the boy's behavior. If that associate is believed to approve of non-delinquency, then this relationship would be a strong deterrent against delinquency involvement.

From this model, a score was obtained for each of 200 boys. This score was compared with the boys' involvement in delinquency as measured by eight different delinquency indicators. The results provided moderate support for the theory, with the association (γ) between scores calculated from the model and the delinquency measures

generally ranging from .15 to .50 depending on the delinquency measure.

The analysis also showed that neither the conventional interpretation of differential association theory nor control theory was as good a predictor of delinquency as was affective ties theory which, in a sense, combined these two perspectives.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For his assistance and advice throughout this project, I would like to thank Dr. James Hackler, with whom I have worked and studied for the past five years. His support and encouragement during this period have been invaluable, both with respect to this thesis and to our other research endeavours.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the other members of my committee. Both Dr. Gordon Fearn and Dr. Donald Kuiken agreed to serve on my committee even though I was not in residence at the University of Alberta, and both were able to send me criticisms and suggestions which substantially improved this thesis.

Dr. Herbert Costner of the University of Washington gave freely of his time and information. As well as being involved in the collection of the data, Dr. Costner provided the theoretical model which was tested here, and gave me a great deal of help in preparing parts of the final draft.

This project was supported initially by Grant #555-24-1 from the Welfare Grants Division of the Canadian

Department of National Health and Welfare. Support for the final stages of the research was provided by Grant #69-0350 from the Canada Council.

Less formal, but no less valuable, was the support provided by my family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Differential Association Theory	1
Control Theory	6
Interpersonal Ties and Delinquency	10
The Affective Ties Model	12
The preferences of associates	14
The closeness of actor and associates.	16
The visibility of action to associates	18
The responsiveness of associates to actor's behavior	20
II. STUDY DESIGN	26
The Sample	26
Operationalizing the Model	26
The preferences of associates	26
The closeness of actor and associates.	27
The visibility of action to associates	29
The responsiveness of associates to actor's behavior	29
Measures of Delinquency	32
Method of Testing the Model	36
III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	41
Evaluation of the Model	41

CHAPTER

Association Between Delinquency Measures	46
Comparison of the Affective Ties Model with Differential Association and Control Theory. .	48
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	54
Review of the Findings	54
Directions of Future Research	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY	60
APPENDIX A	66
APPENDIX B	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Test of Affective Ties Model Using Preference of Associates and Closeness	74
2. Test of Affective Ties Model Using Preference of Associates, Closeness, and Visibility	75
3. Test of Affective Ties Model Using Preference of Associates, Closeness, and Responsiveness of Associates	76
4. Test of Complete Affective Ties Model	77
5. Association (Gamma) Between Delinquency Measures	78
6. Percent Delinquent (Self Report) Controlling for Strength of Ties to Each of Deviant Peers, Conventional Peers and Parents	79
7. Percent Delinquent (Self Report) Controlling for Ties to Conventional Peers and Parents . .	80
8. Percent Delinquent (Self Report) Controlling for Ties to Deviant Peers and Parents	81
9. Percent Delinquent (Self Report) Controlling for Ties to Deviant Peers and Conventional Peers	82
10. Percent Delinquent (Self Report) Controlling for Ties to Conventional Adults, Conventional Peers, and Deviant Peers	83

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Differential Association Theory

Perhaps the most widely tested theory of criminal and delinquent behavior has been Sutherland's theory of differential association. As presented by Sutherland and Cressey (1966:81-82) the theory consists of nine propositions:

1. Criminal behavior is learned.
2. Criminal behavior is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication.
3. The principal part of the learning of criminal behavior occurs within intimate personal groups.
4. When criminal behavior is learned, the learning includes (a) techniques of committing the crime, which are sometimes very complicated, sometimes very simple; (b) the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes.
5. The specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of the legal codes as favorable or unfavorable.
6. A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of the law over definitions unfavorable to violation of the law.
7. Differential associations may vary in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity.
8. The process of learning criminal behavior by association with criminal and anti-criminal patterns involves all of the mechanisms that are involved in other learning.
9. While criminal behavior is an expression of general needs and values it is not explained by those general needs and values since non-criminal behavior is an expression of the same needs and values.

The theory views delinquency as being the product of group influences in which the individual learns both the techniques and the motives and drives involved in committing deviant acts. This learning takes place in a process of socialization within a group context. Thus an act which may be deviant within the context of the larger society may conform to the normative standards of particular groups within the society. Ties to other persons, usually to peers, become crucial in explaining delinquent behavior.

In trying to test this theory, we run into several problems. In fact, in the form set out by Sutherland and Cressey, differential association theory is virtually untestable. One of the greatest weaknesses is the explanation given as to why some people become delinquent and others do not. The answer provided by Sutherland and Cressey--that a person becomes criminal because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of the law over definitions unfavorable to violation of the law--appears to be unfalsifiable because of the vagueness of the term "definitions." Even if we could somehow resolve this difficulty, we would still be faced with the task of trying to operationalize the variables of frequency, duration, priority, and intensity and of distinguishing between

contacts which are favorable to violations of the law and those which are not.

Difficulties in testing have not proven fatal to the theory--in fact the reverse may be true since differential association has provided researchers with a general framework within which a variety of different interpretations are possible. Thus the large number of studies which have supported the theory have been tests of each researcher's interpretation of differential association rather than direct tests of the theory as presented by Sutherland.

Among the tests of differential association theory are those done by Glaser (1960), Short (1958, 1960), Voss (1964), and Matthews (1968). A brief discussion of each of these studies will serve to indicate the type of research that has been done using the differential association perspective:

(1) Glaser cites evidence to support the following hypotheses which were derived from the theory: a) a predominance of criminals or delinquents among intimate associates is predictive of further criminal or delinquent behavior, b) priority of criminal or delinquent behavior--as measured by age at which criminal or delinquent activities began--is predictive of further criminal or delinquent

behavior, c) extent of prior confinement with criminals, which Glaser feels indicates frequency, duration, and intensity of criminal association, is predictive of criminal behavior, and d) alienation from anti-criminal influences is predictive of criminal or delinquent behavior. In conclusion, Glaser states that "prevailing general theories of crime or delinquency [are] either less fruitful than differential association as a source of successful predictors of criminality, or convergent with differential association theory" (1960:12).

(2) Short (1958) looked at interaction with friends who were defined by his respondents as being delinquent. He found that the variable of intensity of interaction had the highest correlation with delinquency involvement, with frequency, duration, and priority having slightly lower levels of correlation. He also found that when specific types of offenses were examined, "the offenses with the highest proportions of significant relations to associations with delinquent friends are more [serious offenses]" (1958:25).

(3) In his later study, Short (1960) focussed on the "intensity" variable and found that those boys and girls who were most involved in delinquent behavior

indicated that their best friends were persons whom they characterized in terms hypothesized to be delinquency producing. For those individuals who were least involved in delinquency, it was found that their best friends were characterized in terms hypothesized to be delinquency inhibiting.

(4) Voss replicated Short's studies. He found that "adolescents who associate extensively with delinquent friends report more delinquent behavior than those whose contacts with delinquent peers is minimal." (1964:85).

(5) Most recently, Matthews (1968) tested the hypothesis that the delinquency scale scores of respondents will be associated with the delinquency scale scores of those individuals selected as their "very best friends." He found that "it is possible to predict the individual's behavior from knowledge of the group's normative behavior" and vice versa (1968:383).

Without going into a detailed critique of these studies, we can see that most of them have been concerned with demonstrating the relationship between association with delinquent friends and involvement in delinquency. For example, Short, whose research has set the pattern for a great deal of the empirical work on differential

association, has stated that "We wish to focus attention upon a particular type of differential association--interaction with friends who are defined by adolescents as delinquent" (1958:21). As Short himself recognizes, this approach does not do justice to Sutherland's theory which entails far more than just association with delinquent friends. The model to be used in the present study, which is still not a completely adequate representation of Sutherland's theory, looks at the affective ties of a boy to several different reference others. Thus, in addition to the boy's relationships with delinquent peers, the affective ties model looks at his ties to conventional peers and to his parents. This model was developed from the perspective of differential association, though the variables used in the model differ from Sutherland's priority, duration, frequency, and intensity.

Control Theory

The model to be tested here, then, has been derived from differential association theory, but it goes beyond just looking at the boys' ties to deviant peers to examine affective ties to conventional adults and to conventional

peers. In so doing, the affective ties model seems to be quite consistent with control theories of delinquency, though the differential association framework attaches greater importance to the influence of deviant peers than is the case with control theory.

In contrast to differential association theory which emphasizes the importance of attachment to persons sharing criminal value patterns, control theory "sees in the delinquent a person relatively free of the intimate attachments, the aspirations, and the moral beliefs that bind most people to a life within the law" (Hirschi, 1969:preface). Thus the delinquent is not viewed as being tied to a different value system, but is seen as being relatively free of ties to society. "If a person does not care about the wishes and expectations of other people--that is, if he is insensitive to the opinion of others--then he is to that extent not bound by the norms. He is free to deviate" (Hirschi, 1969:18). It is his lack of ties to society, then, that frees the individual to commit delinquent acts.

With regard to the relationship between control theory and the affective ties model, Hirschi has given two interpretations of differential association, and if we accept the view that the definitions favorable to violation

of the law are "definitions that free the actor to commit delinquent acts" (1969:15) rather than "conditions that require delinquent behavior" (1969:15) then we have, as Hirschi notes, something of a convergence of control and differential association theories.

If this position is taken, we can ask what contribution ideas derived from differential association can make to this union of the two perspectives. If we assume that an actor's behavior is influenced by either or all of conventional adults, conventional peers, and deviant peers then we have added to Hirschi's formulation of control theory. In his initial statement of the theory, he doesn't differentiate between attachments to conventional and to deviant peers. For example, in analyzing his data with regard to attachment to parents and to peers he concludes that "the hypothesis that attachment to adolescent friends is conducive to delinquency is difficult to justify on theoretical grounds" (1969:145). The argument to be presented here is that while attachment to adolescent friends is not necessarily conducive to delinquency, it may be the case that attachment--not just contact, but affective ties--to deviant peers will be conducive to delinquency, especially in the absence of affective ties to conventional

adults or peers. This notion is not contradicted by Hirschi's data--in fact he concludes that "the theory [control theory] underestimated the importance of delinquent friends. . ." (1969:230).

The inclusion of ties to parents and to conventional peers as independent variables in the model is more in keeping with control theory than with differential association. As Hirschi (1969:98) points out, whereas in differential association theory "lack of attachment to the parents merely increases the probability that the child will be exposed to criminal influences" in control theory "lack of attachment to the parents is directly conducive to delinquency because the unattached child does not have to consider the consequences of his actions for his relations with his parents."

Hirschi (1969) and Jensen (1969) have both examined the relation between attachment to parents and delinquency. They found that, as expected by control theory, attachment to parents has an independent effect on delinquency when the delinquency of friends is held constant. Thus in looking at affective ties to conventional others as independent variables, we have a model which takes into account this particular empirical criticism of differential association.

Interpersonal Ties and Delinquency

Much of the social psychological literature dealing with socialization suggests that affective ties have a great influence upon an individual's behavior. For example, Deutsch and Krauss (1965) state that one of the central hypotheses of Bandura's and Walter's modelling theory (1959) is that rewarding models are more likely to be emulated than are non-rewarding ones. Bandura and Walters elaborate on this further when they say that "in order for the socialization process to be effective, certain minimal conditions must be present. The primary condition is the development of a dependency motive whereby the child learns to want the interest, attention, and approval of others" (1959:29). Originally, this dependency is directed towards the parents, but later in life it begins to involve peers as well as parents (Larson, 1969).

Both family and peer influences have been found to be related to delinquent behavior. Nye (1958) has discussed the importance of the social control functions of the family. He found support for his model which specified that delinquent behavior developed as a consequence of the breakdown of family controls over the teenager. In a

similar fashion, Zucker concludes that "reliably fewer delinquents than non-delinquents have an intimate affectional attachment to their parents . . . delinquents can break their bonds to their parents much more readily than non-delinquents . . . [the evidence] would appear to indicate that delinquents are less fond of their parents than non-delinquents" (1943:47).

Gold (1963) points out the importance of the attraction of a youth toward his parents with respect to the boy's involvement in delinquency. When the family ceases to be attractive to the boy, it loses many of its control functions. The hypothesis that boys who perceived their families as being attractive would be less likely to be delinquent was supported by Kupfer (1966) who also found that the amount of control exercised by the family; the amount of communication within the family; and the selection of parents as behavior models were all inversely related to delinquency. In a slightly different type of study, Allen and Sandhu (1967) found that low family affect was the only variable of those they tested which correlated with high rates of delinquency among both an experimental group of institutionalized boys and a control group of high school boys.

Turning to the effects of peer influence on delinquent behavior, Sutherland and Cressey (1955) cite studies by the Gluecks and by Shaw and McKay which indicate that most delinquencies take place in the company of other boys. The Gluecks studied 500 delinquent boys and found that 492 or 98.4% chummed with other delinquents while of the control group of 500 non-delinquents from the same type of neighbourhoods, only 37 or 7.4% were close friends with delinquents. Shaw and McKay studied court records in Chicago and discovered that 88.2% of the boys who had records had committed delinquencies with other boys and that 91.3% of those engaged in stealing had been with other boys when the act took place. The tests of differential association theory mentioned above also indicate the importance of peer influences on involvement with delinquency as does Lerman's study (1967, 1968) of subcultural delinquency.

The Affective Ties Model

The model to be tested here looks at the connection between involvement in delinquency and affective ties to parents and to both deviant and conventional peers. Costner (1967) has based the model on the assumption that an actor is motivated to maximize the approval and esteem

of his close associates by acting in ways actor believes they will approve and admire, and by avoiding action that actor believes they will know about and disapprove. Working from this assumption, we can look at four major features of the relationship between an actor and his associates which should be taken into account in order to explain actor's behavior:

- (1) The preferences of each of his associates.

What kinds of action will elicit their approval or disapproval?

- (2) The closeness of actor to each of his associates. How much is he concerned about their approval and esteem?

- (3) The visibility of his action to each of his associates. How likely are they to know about his actions?

- (4) The responsiveness to his action of each of his associates. How much would a given action effect their general esteem for him?

If a particular associate is very close, very likely to know of actor's behavior, and very likely to change his opinion about actor on the basis of this knowledge, then that associate would have maximum influence. Thus if that associate is believed to approve of non-delinquency then

this relationship should be a strong deterrent against delinquency involvement. However, if that associate is believed to approve of delinquency then this relationship should encourage delinquency involvement. In contrast, if an associate is so remote from actor that there is no concern for that associate's good opinion, or if an associate would be very unlikely to know about a particular act that is contemplated, or if an associate is already so strongly positive or so strongly negative toward actor that knowledge of a particular act would be unlikely to change that associate's opinion, then this relationship would be of little or no consequence regardless of whether the associate approved or disapproved of delinquency.

The preferences of associates. If all associates preferred and approved of the same kind of behavior, other kinds of variation in the relationship between actor and his associates would be irrelevant. In other words, the closeness, visibility, and responsiveness of the associates assume importance only when different associates of the same actor may require--or may be believed by actor to require--different kinds of action as a condition for giving their approval and esteem. The model used here assumes that when the wishes of different groups of associates are

perceived by actor to be in conflict, actor's dilemma will be resolved according to the preferences of those associates who are closest, to whom the behavior will be most visible, and whose opinions are felt to be most responsive to the behavior in question.

Of course the preferences of associates--the kinds of action that will elicit from them approval and esteem--are not always known to actor. However, he generally has clues to their preferences in terms of what they say, what they do, and how they have reacted to the actions of others. The kinds of clues known to an actor and the way he interprets these clues can be known to an investigator only on the basis of some indicators of the actor's beliefs. Appropriate indicators might include a respondent's statement of his belief about what particular others would approve or disapprove, what particular others would themselves do, or what their reaction would probably be to particular kinds of behavior. In the present study, the indicators are much more crude--we will assume that parents and conventional peers are believed by actor to approve of non-deviant behavior and to disapprove of delinquency and that deviant peers are believed by actor to approve of deviant behavior and to disapprove of "square" or conventional

behavior.

The closeness of actor and associates. The long-standing distinction between a primary and a secondary relationship (Cooley, 1929) points, in a general way, to the relevance of the nature of the tie between an actor and his various associates. Basically, the distinction between these two types of relationship involves the closeness of the associate to the actor. This distinction between relationships that are "close" and those that are more "distant" seems to be what is meant by Sutherland's statement that associations vary in "intensity." By an intense association Sutherland presumably meant a primary association or a close association--one in which actor was concerned with maintaining an established affective tie with that associate. In the present model, we make an assumption very similar to that of Sutherland in that intense or close associations are taken to be more influential than those less intense or less close.¹ The same basic idea

¹Previous research such as that done by Matthews (1968) and Campbell (1965) has suggested that negative affective ties do not operate in the same fashion as do positive ties. In the present analysis, negative ties are treated the same as reactions of indifference to a particular associate.

also seems to be involved in the concept of a reference group, at least insofar as a reference group serves to define norms of ethics and propriety and does not serve simply a comparative function (Merton, 1957). Normative reference groups are, presumably, those groups about whose opinions one cares, i.e., they are "close" in the sense utilized here. Balance theory also suggests the relevance of the closeness of the bond between actor and associate. Those to whom one is positively attracted will, by the assumption of this theory, influence one to see things as they do and to behave in ways that they are believed to approve. For example, Newcomb says "the most stable of interpersonal relationships, in short, are those characterized by both system balance and high attraction--a combination that presupposes an area of mutually shared orientations of importance to system members" (1961:261). Evidently, then, the assumption that interpersonal influence is contingent upon the closeness of the interpersonal bond is often utilized in social psychology and has been given expression in many different forms.

In operationalizing the concept of closeness of affective ties appropriate indicators might include such things as sociometric choices, statements of liking or

respect, observed friendly behavior, and so on. In the data available for the present study, such indicators for individual associates were not available, but a respondent's endorsement of statements of liking for three classes of associates--parents, conventional peers, and deviant peers--will serve as indicators of closeness to these groupings.

The visibility of action to associates. Behavior that is secret, and which promises to remain secret to particular others, can be assumed to have no bearing on their approval and esteem. Actions carried out in the company of others are visible to one's partners and may become visible to those whom one's partners tell about the activity, but they may also remain unknown to those outside a small circle. In the model to be tested here, it is assumed that the probable secrecy or visibility of particular actions is taken into account by actor in assessing the potential consequences of his actions; actions visible to particular associates bring into play the probable reactions of those associates. Actions that remain invisible to particular others render those others less relevant in deciding how actor will behave. There is a rather extensive range of empirical support for this

idea. In a modification of Asch's experiment, Deutsch and Gerard (1955:629-636) divided their subjects into two groups. One of these groups made their judgments publicly and the other group responded in a situation where they could not be identified as individuals. The subjects who made their judgments privately and anonymously showed much less conformity than did the subjects whose decisions were visible to the rest of the group. With regard to the relationship between visibility and delinquent behavior, Kupfer (1966) found that delinquents were more likely than non-delinquents to be out of the direct view or control of their parents.

Empirical clues as to the actor's beliefs about the visibility of his actions to particular others are necessarily indirect. Appropriate indicators might include the physical situation of others in the behavioral situation, the sociometric linkages between those present and those not present along with the expectations about those present "telling," actor's statements about who he feels is likely to find out, and so on. No such indicators are available in the present study. Instead, we shall have to make a rather large assumption. Because adolescents spend so much of their time with other adolescents and because the norms

of "telling" commonly make for a relatively free flow of information among adolescents but place heavy restrictions on the flow of information to adults, we shall assume that the delinquent activities of an adolescent actor are more visible to other adolescents than to adults, including the actor's own parents. This assumption would seem to be supported by the evidence cited earlier that most delinquencies occur in the presence of other adolescents. One should note that visibility is treated as a constant, with greater weight attached to visibility of actor's actions to his peers than to his parents.

The responsiveness of associates to actor's behavior. The approval and esteem of an associate would seem to be a relatively enduring feature of the relationship. A friend does not suddenly become an enemy or a stranger in response to one minor transgression, nor does an enemy or a stranger become a friend in response to one act of kindness. Even less likely is the withdrawing of affection of a parent for his child because of one minor misdeed. However, some relationships are more stable than others. In general, one might readily assume that the relationship between parent and child is less subject to change than

the more ephemeral relationship between adolescent buddies, even though there is undoubtedly considerable variation in the stability of relationships in these two broad classes. The model assumes that when an actor feels that a relationship is so stable that it will be unaffected by the associate's knowledge of a particular action, that associate's opinion of actor is not at stake in deciding on a course of action. If an actor assumes that his parents will love him no matter what he does, he has removed them from effective consideration in deciding what to do. Similarly, if an actor assumes that his parents will dislike him no matter what he does, they will also have no effect on his decision.

Thus in the model we make the assumption that particular associates are taken into account not only in proportion to their closeness and to the visibility of the action to them, but also in proportion to the degree to which the relationship is contingent upon that action. For example, an actor may have strong affective ties to his parents, who represent conventional norms, and also have strong ties to a group of deviant peers. A particular action might promise to be equally visible to both parents and peers. If the actor felt that his parents would react

toward him in an equally favorable or unfavorable way no matter what his action but felt that the approval of his peers depended upon his committing a delinquent act, then according to the affective ties model we would expect him to try to maximize the approval of his deviant peers since his actions could make a difference in their reactions toward him.

Support for the idea of responsiveness comes from sources as disparate as Aichhorn, a psychoanalyst, and Homans, an exchange theorist. According to Aichhorn "if the parents bestow affection without asking any return by way of remuneration, the child does not need to exert himself. Assured of love, he lacks the incentive to give up pleasure in favor of reality" (1935:152). In a similar fashion he says that a child who is punished too often has no incentive to submit to the parents' demands. Homans says somewhat the same thing, though in radically different language when he says "between the alternative actions open to a man in particular circumstances, he is likely to choose the one for which the (mathematical) value of p times v is larger, where p is the probability, as perceived by him, of his action being successful in attaining a particular result, and v is the perceived reward-value to him of that

result" (1969:13).

Once again, the data available make it necessary to use less than ideal empirical indicators. Appropriate indicators of this concept might be hard to develop under any circumstances, but might include such things as actor's statements of how he thinks the associate's opinion of him would change in response to a particular action, or observations of how that associate's opinion had changed in the past. No such detailed indicators were available for this particular study. As will be noted below, the assumption has been made that the parent-child relationship is more stable than is the peer-peer relationship. In effect, in testing the model, this gives more weight to peer influences on behavior than to parental influences.

These four variables can be linked in a predictive formula to measure the probability of an actor deviating from conventional norms and to correlate this with measures of the actor's involvement in delinquency. The idea underlying this model is not that each of the four variables makes an independent contribution to delinquency involvement, but that each conditions the effect of the others. Thus the effect on delinquency involvement of the closeness of a particular associate is dependent on the preferences of

that associate for delinquent or non-delinquent behavior, the perceived visibility of the behavior to that associate, and the presumed responsiveness of that associate. Note that this implies a multiplicative rather than an additive model for the impact of a particular associate or grouping of associates. However, the total impact of all associates is assumed to be additive--that is, the degree of delinquency involvement is assumed to be related to the sum of the influences for or against delinquency of all associates.

To represent the model in a formal way, a quantity "d" can be calculated for each set of associates which will be related to various measures of delinquency involvement and which is defined as follows:

$$d_i = P \cdot C \cdot V \cdot R$$

where P = preference of the associate (or group of associates). Will be either (+) or (-) depending on whether the preference of the associates is for delinquency or non-delinquency.

C = closeness of the associate(s).

V = degree of visibility of the act to the associate(s).

R = degree of responsiveness of the associate(s).

In testing the model for each respondent, this computation was made for each of three groupings of associates--parents, conventional peers, and deviant peers--and not for each individual associate. Then the values for each associate grouping were summed for each respondent to obtain that respondent's total "d" value. The basic hypothesis is that the higher the value of "d" for a given respondent, the greater the involvement of that respondent in delinquency.

In order to facilitate the testing of the separate variables which make up the model, the closeness and preference variables will first be utilized alone. Then the visibility and responsiveness variables will be added separately to the model. This procedure will allow for an assessment of the degree to which the latter two variables add to the predictive capacity of the model.

CHAPTER II

STUDY DESIGN

The Sample

The respondents investigated in this study were subjects chosen to take part in Opportunities For Youth, a delinquency prevention program (Hackler, 1966). During this program, data were obtained on 200 boys ranging in age from 13-15. These boys were divided into experimental and control groups for the program, but in the present study both groups will be used. In selecting subjects, an attempt was made to get a total sample of all the boys in this age group who lived in the four public housing projects in which the study took place.

Two questionnaires were administered to each of the boys, the first at the beginning of the project and the second at its conclusion. In addition to these questionnaires, data were obtained from the boys' teachers and from police records.

Operationalizing the Model

The preferences of associates. We have assumed that

the associates of the boys can be classified either as conventional or deviant and that conventional others will approve of conventional behavior and disapprove of deviant behavior and that deviant others will do just the reverse. Thus conventional adults and peers are assumed to have a negative influence on delinquent behavior while deviant others are assumed to have a positive influence.

The closeness of actor and associates. The questionnaire asked direct questions concerning affective ties towards parents, conventional peers and deviant peers.

1. Affect toward parents. The questionnaire included 23 questions (see Appendix A) dealing with closeness within the family. An average of these 23 responses was used as an indicator of each boy's affect toward his parents.¹

In working out the model, it was assumed that parents represent conventional adults. This assumption is supported by several researchers, among them Haskell (1960) and Hirschi (1969). In his study of residents of the Berkshire Home for Boys, Haskell found that the boys "spontaneously

¹Cutting points for the measures used in this study are discussed in Appendix A.

identified the views of parents as opposed to truancy, fighting, stealing, destruction, and other forms of delinquent behavior" (1960:222). Hirschi found an inverse relationship between delinquency and affectional identification with parents (1969:92) and concluded that "the lower-class parent, even if he is himself committing criminal acts, does not publicize this fact to his children. Since he is as likely to express allegiance to the substantive norms of middle-class society as is the middle-class parent, he operates to foster obedience to a system of norms to which he himself may not conform" (1969:108).

2. Affect toward conventional peers. To measure the closeness between a boy and his conventional peers, the question was asked:

Now think of the three or four kids that you know who almost never get into trouble. Adults would probably say these kids are 'OK' or 'nice.' If these kids were your friends would they be just about the way you wanted them to be?

Just about the way
I want them to be.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Just about the oppo-
site of the way I
want them to be.

3. Affect toward deviant peers. To measure the closeness between a boy and his deviant peers, the question was asked:

Now think of the three or four kids you know who sometimes get into trouble. Adults would

say these kids are 'wild' or maybe even 'bad.'
 If these kids were your close friends would
 they be just the way you would want them to be?

Just about the way		Just about the oppo-
I want them to be.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	site of the way I
		want them to be.

The visibility of action to associates. In testing the model, we shall assign a higher visibility to the boys' behavior to peers than to parents. It seems reasonable to assume that the boys spend more time with each other than with parents, if only because most adolescents are in school all day with their peers. That this goes beyond the school situation is indicated by Faris (1953) who cites quotations from Elmtown's Youth (Hollingshead, 1949), and Street Corner Society (Whyte, 1943) which indicate how much of the time of both the Elmtown adolescent and the Boston corner boy is spent in the company of peers.

The responsiveness of associates to actor's behavior.

Because of limitations of the data, it is necessary to make several simplifying assumptions in order to test this part of the model. One way of looking at the perceived responsiveness of those around the boy might be by finding out whether he has a favorable or unfavorable opinion of himself. Costner (1967) suggests that:

When we say an actor has an 'unfavorable' self concept or holds himself in low regard, we are saying in effect, that the actor has either (a) come to expect others representing the conventional standards of the community to respond unfavorably to him no matter what he does, or (b) come to assume that the expectations of others representing the conventional standards of the community are beyond his capacity and hence eliciting approval from them is beyond his capacity. . . we may assume that to the degree that an actor has an unfavorable self concept, he perceives the reaction of conventional others to him to be rigid . . . in short, then, the degree to which a self concept is positive may be taken as an indicator of the degree to which conventional others, and especially adults, are 'non-rigid' or, in the terminology used here, 'non-responsive.'

Boys with an unfavorable attitude towards themselves would thus be expected to be less influenced by the opinions of parents than would boys who had a more favorable self concept. Note that it is not suggested that a person with an unfavorable self concept expects everyone to respond negatively towards him or that he assumes that the expectations of all of his associates are beyond his capacity. Rather, the assumption is that an unfavorable self concept is defined as unfavorable in terms of predominant community standards and that it is these standards that he does not expect to live up to and it is conventional others that he expects to respond negatively no matter what he does.

Thus a self concept question was used as an

indicator of perceived responsiveness of others:

What about yourself? For a boy your age are
you just about the way you want to be?

Just about the way
I want to be.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Just about the oppo-
site of the way I
want to be.

Since the linkage between the abstract concept of responsiveness of others and the empirical indicator of self concept is admittedly somewhat tenuous, a brief digression might be appropriate. With regard to the concept presented here, a theoretical rationale has been developed and by using this rationale the particular indicator can be inferred from the theoretical concept.

If, as Sofios (1968:219-20) points out, the rationale contains hypotheses as to why the concept introduced should be related to observable events, then the empirical evidence by which we judge the success of our model will also serve as evidence bearing on the hypotheses implicit in the rationale. In other words, we are testing the rationale for our choice of indicators of the concepts in our model as well as testing the hypothesis that the model will discriminate between delinquents and non-delinquents.

Of course looking at the test procedure from this perspective makes evaluation of the findings somewhat difficult. If the model was successful in discriminating

between delinquents and non-delinquents and if the addition of visibility and responsiveness increased the predictive power of the model, then we would probably not question the hypotheses implicit in connecting the indicators with the abstract concepts because the data would be consistent with the rationale used in selecting the indicators. However, if the model failed to discriminate between delinquents and non-delinquents or if the addition of visibility and/or responsiveness failed to improve the predictive power of the model, then we are faced with the problem of deciding whether our lack of success was due to weaknesses in the theoretical basis for the model, or whether it was due to poor indicators of the abstract concepts. This problem is common to all research, but is worth mentioning here because of the admitted weakness of these particular indicators.

Measures of Delinquency

Rather than judging the model on the basis of one or two measures of delinquency involvement, it was decided to use eight different measures. It was recognized that each of these measures has its own particular strengths and weaknesses and it was hoped that multiple indicators would reduce some of the problems involved in using only one type

of measure.

1. Self reported delinquency. In order to avoid certain biases inherent in official delinquency records, a self report index was used. The index used (see Appendix A) used six items from the Nye-Short scale (1957), one item that was used in their scale but which was dropped in the scaling procedure, and two items added for the Opportunities For Youth study. The nine items were preceded by the question:

How often have you done these things?

2. Perception of peer behavior. The index of perception of peer behavior used the same items that were used in the self reported delinquency measure, but the question asked of the boys was changed to:

How often have your close friends done these things?

This question was developed in accordance with reasoning first advanced by the Tobys (1961). They made the assumption, which has been supported by Kupfer (1966:128), that if a boy had no delinquent record himself but had delinquent friends, then he actually was delinquent but had not been caught.

3. Police contact of acquaintances. Using the same assumption as in the measure of perception of peer behavior, the respondent was asked:

How many young people (under 21) do you know who have ever been in trouble with the police for other than a traffic violation?

Response categories were none, one or two, 3 to 5, 6 to 10, and more than 10.

4. Court referral of acquaintances. This measure is similar to the measure of police contact of acquaintances except the question asked was:

How many young people (under 21) do you know who have ever been taken to Juvenile Court?

5. Teacher anticipation of deviance. The boys' teachers were asked:

What would you guess this student's chances of getting into trouble with the law in the future?

The accuracy of teacher ratings has been investigated by the researchers such as Khleif who found that "such judgments have been found to be indicative of those that are subsequently made by four community agencies that deal with deviant behavior--the Juvenile Court, the Child Guidance Clinic, and, by extension, their two screening agencies: the Police Youth Bureau and the Visiting

Teachers Service. This suggests that teachers do make sensitive and reliable observations of behavioral problems." (1964:279-80).

6. Police contact prior to Opportunities For Youth. To determine police contacts the boys' names were mechanically matched with those in police files. This procedure may have resulted in an under-reporting of police contacts since if either the first or last name of each boy was spelled differently from the name in police records, then the match was not made. For example, names like Bill Blake and William Blake would not be matched. To prevent over-reporting of contacts because a boy in the project had the same name as another boy who had police contact, birthdates were also matched. This precaution may have served to eliminate some correct matches if birthdates were recorded incorrectly.

The reason police rather than court records were used is that they are more complete than court records in that many boys contacted by the police are handled in ways other than sending them to court. The major disadvantage of both court and police data is that they are measuring the behavior of an agency as well as the behavior of the boys.

7. Police contact during Opportunities For Youth. Police records for the nine month period of Opportunities For Youth were used.

8. Police contact after Opportunities For Youth. Police records for the two year period following Opportunities For Youth were used.

Method of Testing the Model

In testing the model, a score d which is the individual's score on the model will be calculated for each of the 200 boys. This d score will be compared with various measures of delinquency for that individual to see how closely the predicted involvement in delinquency (d) is associated with the boy's actual behavior as measured by the various measures of delinquency.

Evaluation of the model will be carried out in several steps. First of all, only parts of the model will be used. Since the key variables are those concerning the affective ties of the actor with his various associates, the variables of preferences of associates (P), and closeness of actor and associates (C) will be examined first. Each of the other variables, visibility of action to associates (V) and responsiveness of others to actor's behavior

(R), will be added to the model in combination with the first two variables to see if their addition to the model has any effect on the association between d (the score obtained from the model) and the delinquency measures.

In accordance with the rationale discussed above, weights were assigned to each variable used in the model in the following manner:

Preferences of associates

- P = + for deviant peer
- for conventional associate (peer or parent)

Closeness of actor and associates

- C = 0 for complete indifference or dislike of actor for associate (associate may be adult or peer)
- 1 for weak positive tie
- 2 for moderately positive tie
- 3 for strongly positive tie

Visibility of action to associates

- V = 1 for adult associate
- 2 for adolescent associate

Responsiveness of associates to actor's behavior

- R = 1 if negative self concept and if the associate is a conventional adult
- 2 if moderately positive self concept and the associate is a conventional adult
- OR
- if negative self concept and the associate is a conventional adolescent
- 3 if very positive self concept and the associate is a conventional adult
- OR
- if moderately or very positive self concept and associate is a conventional adolescent

3 regardless of self concept if associate is a deviant peer

In computing the d score for each individual case, it is necessary to apply the $P \cdot C \cdot V \cdot R$ formula to each of the boy's associates, i.e., to conventional adults, conventional peers, and deviant peers. Scores for each of these three groups are added together to get the final score d.

For example, case #202 had an indifferent affective tie toward his parents, a moderately strong tie to conventional adolescent associates, a negative affective tie to deviant peers, and a very positive self concept. Visibility is assumed to be greater for peers than it is for parents. A score d was calculated as follows:

Conventional adults		Conventional peers		Deviant peers
$d = P \cdot C \cdot V \cdot R$	+	$P \cdot C \cdot V \cdot R$	+	$P \cdot C \cdot V \cdot R$
$(-) \cdot 0 \cdot 1 \cdot 3$		$(-) \cdot 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 3$		$(+) \cdot 0 \cdot 2 \cdot 3$
$d = 0$	+	(-12)	+	0
$d = -12$				

A breakdown of the example will perhaps illustrate the process more clearly. The associates in the first segment of the model were conventional adults, so the sign for P is (-). In this case, the affective tie was one of indifference, so $C = 0$. The value of V for conventional adults is 1 and, since the boy has a very positive self concept,

the value of R is 3. For ties to conventional adults, the score is $(-) \cdot 0 \cdot 1 \cdot 3 = 0$. We can see that because of the multiplicative feature of the model, where the affective tie is negative or one of indifference, that other has no effect on the d score.

For conventional peers there is a moderately positive tie so the value for C is 2. According to the weighting factors used the sign for P is $(-)$ and the value for V is 2. Since self concept is very positive, the value for R is 3. For ties to conventional peers, then, the score is $(-) \cdot 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 3 = -12$.

For deviant peers, there was a negative tie so the value for C is 0. Using the weighting factors for deviant peers, the sign for P is $(+)$ and the value for V is 2. Since self concept is very positive, the value for R is 3. For ties to deviant peers the score is $(+) \cdot 0 \cdot 2 \cdot 3 = 0$.

After scores were computed for each of these three groups of associates, a d score was computed by adding together each of these scores. Thus the d score for each boy gives us the total effect on delinquent behavior of his affective ties with conventional adults (parents), conventional peers, and deviant peers.

After a d score was computed for each of the 200 cases, a distribution of these scores was set up which ranked the scores from high to low. The distribution was divided into two groups, one of high d scores, the other of low d scores.²

The delinquency scores were also dichotomized and gamma (Costner, 1965) was computed to give a measure of the association between the d score given by the model and the boys' involvement in delinquency according to each of the eight indicators used.

²Analysis was also carried out with the groups divided into high, medium, and low d scores. The results were very similar to those obtained with only categories of high and low, so only those results will be discussed here.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Evaluation of the Model

In order to determine the impact of each of the variables the model was first tested using only preference of associates and closeness of actor and associates. It was necessary to use both of these since preference of associates refers to the expected direction (rather than strength) of the influence of actor's associates and cannot really be tested except in combination with one or more of the other variables. Visibility of actions to associates and responsiveness of associates to actor's behavior were added separately, and finally the complete model was tested.

Table 1 gives the results of the test using only the variables of preference and closeness of associates. The association is strongest between the score computed from the model and self reported delinquency, with 32.7% of the boys with high d scores reporting themselves as having been involved in delinquency while only 15.6% of those boys having low d scores reported themselves delinquent. The associations were all positive, indicating that the relationships

were in the same direction for each of the indicators, and ranged from .17 for police contact during the Opportunities For Youth project to .45 for self reported delinquency.

Very similar results are shown in Table 2 which gives the results of the test using visibility of actions to associates as well as preference and closeness of those associates. In Table 2, the associations are once again all in a positive direction, ranging from .11 for police contact prior to Opportunities For Youth to .47 for self reported delinquency. Apparently, addition of visibility has not increased the ability of the model to predict delinquency.

Table 3 shows the results of the test when responsiveness of associates to actor's behavior is added to preference and closeness of associates. Once again, the results are very similar to those reported in Table 1. All associations are positive and range from .05 for police contact during the Opportunities For Youth project to .47 for self reported delinquency.

When the complete model--including preference and closeness, visibility, and responsiveness of others--is tested (Table 4), the results are similar to those shown in Tables 1-3, though the association between the d score

and self reported delinquency has increased to .52. The associations ranged from .05 for police contact before the Opportunities For Youth project to .52 for self reported delinquency.

These results indicate that for self reported delinquency at least, the affective ties model is moderately effective in predicting delinquency involvement. However, adding visibility of actor's behavior to his associates and the responsiveness of those associates to actor's behavior to the basic variables of preference and closeness has very little effect on the predictive power of the model. When we try to determine some of the reasons for this, we see that several alternate explanations are possible.

First of all, with reference to visibility, it is possible that the rationale underlying the model is incorrect and that visibility of one's behavior to one's reference others does not affect that behavior. An alternative explanation, which is consistent with our rationale, is given by Hirschi. He found that "virtual supervision" of the boys in his study by their parents was such that "children who perceive their parents as unaware of their whereabouts are highly likely to have committed delinquent acts" (1969:89). Thus it is the boy's perception that his

parents are aware of his activities and not the actual visibility of his behavior that is important. Hirschi also found that the majority of the boys in his sample were well supervised according to this measure, but those who were not were very likely to have been involved in delinquency. It appears then, that the use of visibility in the affective ties model may have been on the right track, but that much more is entailed than just the actual visibility of the boys' behavior.

In connection with the variable responsiveness of others it was argued that the test of the model would also serve as a test of the rationale used in deriving the various indicators of the concepts used in the model. Thus failure of this or any other variable to add to the predictive power of the model can be attributed either to weaknesses in the theory underlying the model or to inadequacies in the rationale used in selecting indicators of the variables used in the model. There has been a great deal of empirical support for various interpretations of differential association theory, and since the affective ties model is consistent with that perspective, we might look at the particular indicators selected rather than for weaknesses in the underlying theory. For example, in

linking responsiveness of others with the self concept indicator, the assumption was made that an unfavorable self concept is defined as unfavorable in terms of predominant community standards, that it is these standards that the boy does not expect to live up to, and that it is conventional others that he expects to respond negatively no matter what he does. Research into the self-evaluation of delinquents done by Hall (1966) does not support this assumption. He found that "increasing the delinquency orientation will have the effect of raising the level of self-evaluation" (1966:156). In Hall's study, 59% of those boys with a high delinquency orientation had a high level of self-evaluation while only 35% of the boys with a low delinquency orientation had a high level of self-evaluation. This suggests that a different indicator of responsiveness of others would be required if the model were to be given a fair test.

Another possible source of error may have been in the weighting used in testing the model. There was theoretical justification for the relative weighting factors used in operationalizing each of the variables in the model, but there was of necessity a certain degree of arbitrariness involved in selecting the exact values to be

assigned. For example, even though evidence may strongly support the notion that a strongly positive tie to a parent or peer has a greater effect on a boy's behavior than does a weak positive tie, there is nothing that tells us that the effect will be precisely three times as great. Thus all of the variables used in the model are affected somewhat by the necessity of assigning differential weights. Even if "precise" weights had been used, any improvement in prediction might have been hidden by the rather crude dichotomizing procedure employed in ranking the boys' d scores.

Association Between Delinquency Measures

Table 5 shows the correlations between the various delinquency measures used. All of the correlations are positive and most are below .50. There are several clusters, such as those between the various police contact measures; between court referral of acquaintances and police contact of acquaintances; and between self report and perception of peer behavior. In each of these clusters there is a similarity in operational indicators which may have led to abnormally high relationships. The relatively weak relationships between the rest of the indicators suggests either

that the indicators are measuring different things--that there is no underlying continuum of delinquency involvement--or that there is a great deal of measurement error in these indicators. In either case, the use of multiple indicators which are only weakly related has provided a rather demanding test of the model.

Tables 1-4 show that there is a great deal of variation in the success of the model depending on which of the delinquency indicators is used. Self reported delinquency consistently gives the most favorable results while police contacts before and during the project (both of which covered relatively short periods of time) were the least favorable. Without becoming involved in the controversy over the relative merits of self reported versus official measures of delinquency (c.f. Hackler and Lutt, 1969) the fact that self report tries to get at the behavior of the individual rather than at the behavior of agencies such as the courts or the police suggests that self report might be the most appropriate measure to use in this particular study. The fact that police contacts for the two years after the project give the next most favorable results indicates, however, that the success of the model is not limited only to prediction of delinquency involvement as

measured by self report.

Comparison of the Affective Ties Model with
Differential Association and Control Theory

In an earlier chapter, the linkage between differential association (or at least one interpretation of differential association) and control theory was discussed. As it has been conventionally treated, differential association theory has emphasized the effect on delinquency involvement of ties to deviant peers. Control theory, on the other hand, regards ties to any group of associates--regardless of that group's preferences--as delinquency-inhibiting. The affective ties model essentially combines these two perspectives and views ties to conventional associates as mitigating against delinquency involvement and ties to deviant peers as being conducive to delinquency involvement.

Tables 6-10 allow us to compare these three ways of trying to predict delinquency. In this set of tables, the affective ties model has been simplified so as to include only the variables of closeness and preference, and only the self reported delinquency measure is used as this is the "best" of the delinquency indicators.

Table 6 looks at self reported delinquency controlling for strength of ties to each of deviant peers, conventional peers, and parents. Ties to both sets of conventional associates discriminated fairly well between delinquents and non-delinquents but, rather surprisingly, ties to deviant peers did rather poorly as a predictor of delinquency involvement. While 24% of those with weak or nonexistent ties to deviant peers were delinquent, only 26.6% of those boys having moderate or strong ties to deviant peers were delinquent. Not only is this finding inconsistent with much of the research that has been done based on differential association theory, it also conflicts with findings obtained from a study done using another group of boys involved in the Opportunities For Youth project (Hackler, et al, 1970). The effects of this upon the present study will be briefly discussed below.

While Table 6 looked at each group of associates individually, in Tables 7-9 we are concerned with combinations of two groups of associates. Table 7, which shows the relationship between ties to parents and to conventional peers and involvement in delinquency, provides strong support for the control theory perspective. As would be predicted on the basis of control theory, 43.5% of those

boys having weak or nonexistent ties with both conventional peers and parents were delinquent while only 16.8% of those boys having moderate or strong ties with both conventional peers and parents were delinquent. For the two groups of boys having moderate or strong ties to one set of associates and weak ties to the other, the percentage involved in delinquency was almost identical--25.6% and 25.9%. This table indicates rather clearly the impact on delinquency involvement of the lack of ties to the conventional order.

Tables 8 and 9 do not show the same sort of interaction between strengths of ties to each of two groups of associates and delinquency involvement that is found in Table 7. This is due, at least in part, to the very small difference accounted for by ties to deviant peers.

Table 10, which looks simultaneously at ties to parents and to both conventional and deviant peers, allows us to compare the affective ties model with control theory and differential association theory. According to control theory, boys who have no strong ties to any group of associates are the most likely to become delinquent. Thus if we could show that ties to deviant peers increase the likelihood of involvement in delinquency among those with weak

or nonexistent ties to conventional others, the value of modifying control theory to take into account the preferences of a boy's associates would be indicated.

In most interpretations of differential association theory, ties to deviant peers is seen as the crucial variable in predicting delinquency involvement. If it could be shown that a lack of ties to conventional associates increases the likelihood of delinquency involvement among those who have affective ties to deviant peers--a modification which is, as mentioned above, consistent with Sutherland's reasoning--then once again we would have support for the affective ties model.

Looking at Table 10, we would predict from control theory that involvement in delinquency would be greatest among those boys with no ties to any of the three groups of associates. This prediction is not supported by the data. Instead, the prediction made by the affective ties model--that boys with weak or nonexistent ties to conventional associates but who have moderate or strong ties to deviant peers would be most involved in delinquency--is supported. Forty-two and nine-tenths percent of those with weak or nonexistent ties to any of the three groups of associates and 20% of those with moderate or strong ties to all three

groups report themselves as delinquent, a difference of 22.9%. Of those boys with weak ties to conventional associates but with moderate or strong ties to deviant peers, 58.3% are delinquent while of those with weak ties to deviant peers and moderate or strong ties to conventional associates only 15.2% are delinquent, a difference of 43.1%.

In order to compare affective ties with differential association, we must look at Tables 6 and 10. Cells a and b of Table 6 compare the self reported delinquency of those boys who have moderate or strong ties to deviant peers with boys having weak or non-existent ties. The results show very little difference--only 2.6% between the two groups.² This provides very little support for the interpretation of differential association discussed here. When we turn to Table 10, however, we see that those individuals who have ties to deviant peers but not to conventional peers or

²As mentioned above, this small difference is inconsistent with much of the research on the influence of deviant peers on delinquent behavior. However, even if the results had shown a greater difference between the two groups, the substantive conclusions of this study would probably have been the same as we would expect that the difference in delinquency involvement between those who have ties to deviant peers and not to conventional associates and those who have ties to conventional associates and not to deviant peers would also be greater.

adults are the most delinquent (58.3%), while those who have ties to conventional peers and adults but not to deviant peers are the least delinquent (15.2%) --a difference of 43.1%. Thus for the present data at least, ties to deviant peers are not in themselves good predictors of delinquency, though in the absence of ties to conventional adults and peers, ties to deviant peers seem to be quite conducive to delinquency involvement.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Review of the Findings

This study reported the test of a delinquency theory developed by Costner (1967). A predictive model based on the four variables of this theory--preferences of associates, closeness of actor and associate, visibility of action to associates, and the responsiveness of associates to actor's behavior--was tested on a group of 200 boys between the ages of 13 and 15 who lived in four public housing projects in Seattle.

In testing the affective ties model, a score was calculated for each of the boys based on his ties to conventional adults (parents), conventional peers, and deviant peers. This score, which was in a sense a prediction about whether or not the boy was involved in delinquency, was compared with eight different indicators of the boy's delinquency involvement.

The model was moderately successful in differentiating between delinquents and non-delinquents. Generally, the association (gamma) between the delinquency score

obtained from the model and the individuals' involvement in delinquency ranged from .15 to .50 depending upon which delinquency measure was used. All associations were in the predicted direction regardless of the measure of delinquency. The predictive power of the model was not increased when the variables of visibility and responsiveness were added to preference and closeness of associates. Possible reasons for this were discussed.

A second step in the analysis involved comparing the affective ties model with differential association theory and control theory. The data showed that neither of the more traditional approaches was as successful as the affective ties model in predicting delinquency involvement. Thus the present study demonstrates the value of linking differential association and control theory so that the effects of ties to each of deviant peers, conventional peers, and conventional adults and the preferences of each of these groups are all taken into account.

This convergence of the two perspectives is not really inconsistent with either Sutherland's original formulation of differential association or Hirschi's statement of control theory. Sutherland spoke of delinquency occurring when there was "an excess of definitions

favorable to violation of the law over definitions unfavorable to violation of the law" (Sutherland and Cressey, 1966: 81-82). Thus, implicitly at least, he recognized the importance of ties to conventional associates as well as to deviant peers. Something of a revision in control theory is needed in order to account for the finding that ties to deviant peers are conducive to involvement in delinquency. This has been recognized by Hirschi who concluded that his formulation of control theory had "underestimated the importance of delinquent friends" (1969:230).

Hirschi found that in his sample there was no subculture of delinquency with strong bonds between the members and that relationships between delinquents are relatively hostile and distrustful. The data reported here give no reason to question this and, even though Hirschi's findings call into question some interpretations of differential association, they do not conflict with the model developed here. Rather than postulating a strong moral community which pressures the boy into committing delinquent acts we might suggest, in keeping with control theory, that delinquents may have the same beliefs as do conventional adolescents, but that contact with deviant peers might make delinquency involvement more likely among those who have

only weak ties to the conventional order. For example, in the case of a delinquent activity such as heroin use, it may be that those who engage in such activities do not have ties (or bonds, to use the language of control theory) to conventional society. However, because of the need to learn the techniques of using the drug and in order to obtain the drug, some sort of ties to deviant peers are required. In this example, and in the case of other sorts of delinquent acts, it is not necessary to view the adolescent as being pushed into delinquency by a group of delinquent peers, but merely that for an adolescent who does not have strong ties to the conventional order, ties to deviant peers may facilitate involvement in delinquency.

Directions of Future Research

As DeFleur and Quinney (1966) ably demonstrate, differential association can be derived from postulates of a more general learning theory. We can view Glaser's article on differential identification theory (1956) and Burgess' and Akers' discussion of differential association-reinforcement theory (1966) as attempts to specify or to modify Sutherland's conception of how criminal behavior--and by implication other kinds of behavior--come to be

learned. No data are available in the present study to investigate either of these theories so they will receive only brief mention here.

Glaser says that Sutherland himself emphasized the importance of differential identification rather than just differential contact and he (Glaser) sought to clarify differential association by reconceptualizing the theory "in role-taking imagery, drawing heavily on Mead as well as on later refinements of role theory" (1956:440). Basically, differential identification theory states that "a person pursues criminal behavior to the extent that he identifies himself with real or imaginary persons from whose perspective his criminal behavior seems acceptable" (1956:440). Hall's study of delinquency identification and self-evaluation (1966) provides empirical support for this theory. He found that "the greater the involvement in delinquency⁷ as measured by adjudication criteria the more likely one is dealing with the types who have stronger degrees of delinquent identification" (1966:157).

Though not explicitly referring to affective ties theory, Glaser suggests that the predictive value of the importance of social relationships "may be that warm relationships inside the family strengthen the identifications

with it" (1956:443). We would suggest that any future tests of affective ties theory examine the identification of the boys with their various reference others in an attempt to determine whether or not the relationship between affective ties and delinquency operates in the manner suggested by Glaser.

The other extension of differential association which is worthy of mention here is the Burgess and Akers differential association-reinforcement theory. They seek to modify the Sutherland theory to take into account principles of modern learning theory, a modification they feel will make differential association both more sophisticated and more testable. In relating affective ties theory to this perspective, one would have to try to determine how positive and negative reinforcement on the part of a boy's reference others operate in the process of learning criminal or non-criminal patterns of behavior.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aichhorn, August.

1935 Wayward Youth. Cleveland: Meridian Books.

Allen, Donald E. and Harjit S. Sandhu.

1967 "A comparative study of delinquents and non-delinquents: family affect, religion, and personal income." Social Forces 46 (December): 263-269.

Bandura, Albert and Richard H. Walters.

1959 Adolescent Aggression. New York: The Ronald Press.

Blalock, Hubert M.

1965 "Some implications of random measurement error for causal inferences." American Journal of Sociology 71(July): 35-47.

Burgess, Robert L. and Ronald L. Akers.

1966 "A differential association-reinforcement theory of criminal behavior." Social Problems 14 (Fall): 128-147.

Campbell, David H.

1965 Intra-individual Cognitive Balance. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Washington.

Cooley, Charles Horton.

1929 Social Organization. New York: Scribner's.

Costner, Herbert C.

1965 "Criteria for measures of association." American Sociological Review 30 (June): 341-353.

1967 Personal correspondence with the writer.

Cressey, Donald R. and Rita Volkman.

1963 "Differential association and the rehabilitation of drug addicts." American Journal of Sociology 69 (September): 129-142.

DeFleur, Melvin L. and Richard Quinney.

1966 "A reformulation of Sutherland's differential association theory and a strategy for empirical verification." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 3 (January): 1-22.

Deutsch, Martin and Harold B. Gerard.

- 1955 "A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgment." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 51: 629-636.

Deutsch, Martin and Robert M. Krauss.

- 1965 *Theories in Social Psychology*. New York: Basic Books.

Faris, Robert E. L.

- 1953 "Small group research movement." Pp. 155-184 in Muzafer Sherif and M. O. Wilson (eds.), *Group Relations at the Crossroads*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Glaser, Daniel.

- 1956 "Criminality theories and behavioral images." *American Journal of Sociology* 61 (March): 433-444.
- 1960 "Differential association and criminological prediction." *Social Problems* 8 (Summer): 6-14.

Gold, Martin.

- 1963 *Status Forces in Delinquent Boys*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan; Institute for Social Research.

Hackler, James C.

- 1966 "Boys, blisters and behavior." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* (July): 155-164.

Hackler, James C. and Melanie Lautt.

- 1969 "Systematic bias in measuring self-reported delinquency." *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 6 (May): 92-106.

Hackler, James C., Eric Linden, and Herbert Costner.

- 1970 "Affective ties of youth, opportunity structure, and delinquency." Paper to be presented at the 7th World Congress of Sociology, Varna, Bulgaria.

Hall, Peter M.

- 1966 "Identification with the delinquent subculture and level of self-evaluation." *Sociometry* 29 (June): 146-158.

Haskell, Martin Roy.

- 1960 "Toward a reference group theory of juvenile delinquency." *Social Problems* 8 (Summer): 219-230.

Hirschi, Travis.

- 1969 *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California.

Hollingshead, August B.

- 1949 *Elmtown's Youth*. New York: Wiley.

Homans, George C.

- 1969 "The sociological relevance of behaviorism." Pp. 1-24 in Robert L. Burgess and Don Bushell (eds.), *Behavioral Sociology*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Jensen, Gary.

- 1969 "The family and delinquency: differential association as an intervening process." Unpublished manuscript, Department of Sociology, University of Washington.

Khelif, B. B.

- 1964 "Teachers as predictors of juvenile delinquency and psychiatric disturbance." *Social Problems* 11 (Winter): 270-282.

Kornhauser, Ruth.

- 1963 "Theoretical issues in the sociological study of juvenile delinquency." Center for the Study of Law and Society, Berkeley. Mimeographed.

Kupfer, George.

- 1966 *Middle Class Delinquency in a Canadian City*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Washington.

Larson, Lyle E.

- 1969 "The salience hierarchy during adolescence: the situation hypothesis revisited." A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, York University, Toronto.

Lerman, Paul.

- 1967 "Argot, symbolic deviance and subcultural delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 32 (June): 209-224.
- 1968 "Individual values, peer values, and subcultural delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 33 (April): 219-235.

Liksa, Allen E.

- 1969 "Interpreting the causal structure of differential association theory." *Social Problems* 16 (Spring): 485-492.

Matthews, Victor M.

- 1968 "Differential identification." *Social Problems* 15 (Winter): 376-383.

Merton, Robert K.

- 1957 *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press.

Newcomb, Theodore M.

- 1961 *The Acquaintance Process*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Nye, F. Ivan.

- 1958 *Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Nye, F. Ivan and James F. Short, Jr.

- 1957 "Scaling delinquent behavior." *American Sociological Review* 22 (June): 326-331.

Short, James F., Jr.

- 1958 "Differential association with delinquent friends and delinquent behavior." *Pacific Sociological Review* (Spring): 20-25.
- 1960 "Differential association as a hypothesis: problems of empirical testing." *Social Problems* 8 (Summer): 14-24.

Rosen, Bernard C.

- 1955 "Conflicting group membership: a study of parent-peer group cross pressures." American Sociological Review 20 (April): 155-161.

Sofios, N.

- 1968 Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University.

Sutherland, Edwin H. and Donald R. Cressey.

- 1955 Principles of Criminology. 5th Edition. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott.
- 1966 Principles of Criminology. 7th Edition. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.

Toby, Jackson and Marcia Toby.

- 1961 "Low school status as a pre-disposing factor in subcultural delinquency." A Cooperative Research Project of the United States Office of Education and Rutgers - The State University (Mimeographed).

Voss, Harwin L.

- 1964 "Differential association and reported delinquent behavior: a replication." Social Problems 12 (Summer): 78-85.

Whyte, William F.

- 1943 Street Corner Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zucker, Herbert J.

- 1943 "Affectional identification and delinquency." Archives of Psychology 286 (May): 1-60.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS TAKEN FROM THE OPPORTUNITIES
FOR YOUTH STUDY

The following items were taken from Dr. Hackler's questionnaire given to the Seattle boys who were involved in the Opportunities For Youth project.

The following questions are about you and your parents. If your answer to the question is yes, circle (1), if your answer is no, circle (2).

	Yes	No
1. Do you enjoy telling your parents about your good times?	1	2
2. Do you enjoy talking over your plans with your parents?	1	2
3. Is it true that what your parents don't know about what you do won't hurt them? .	1	2
4. Do you enjoy doing extra things you don't have to do to please your parents?	1	2
5. Do you tell your parents when you get into some kind of trouble?	1	2
6. Do you often feel angry at your parents? .	1	2
7. In general, do you feel that you get a "square deal" with your parents?	1	2
8. Do you think "Oh what's the use" after you have tried to explain to your parents about something you've done?	1	2
9. Are you interested in what your parents think about you?	1	2
10. Are your parents interested in what you do?	1	2
11. Do your parents encourage you to discuss your problems with them?	1	2

	Yes	No
12. Do your parents make fun of your ideas?	1	2
13. Have you ever felt ashamed of your parents?	1	2
14. If it were possible to change real parents into ideal parents, would you change your parents?	1	2
15. Do you think your parents have your best interests at heart?	1	2
16. Do your parents show more interest in your brothers and sisters than they show in you?	1	2
17. Do other parents show more interest in their children than yours show in you? . .	1	2
18. Do your parents praise you when you do your work well?	1	2
19. Do your parents ever seem to wish you were a different sort of person?	1	2
20. Do you think your parents try to understand your problems and worries?	1	2
21. Do your parents punish you when you don't deserve it?	1	2
22. Does your family do anything special for your birthday?	1	2
23. Does your family give you birthday presents?	1	2

After reversing some of the items to make the ordering consistent the scores were added together and a mean score was computed. Individuals with a mean score of 1.5

and below were said not to be closely tied to their parents, those scoring 1.6 were weakly tied, those scoring 1.7 and 1.8 were moderately tied, and those scoring 1.9 to 2.0 were strongly tied.

How often have you done these things? Circle the number of your answer.¹

	<u>Often</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Never</u>
Drive a car without a drivers' license	1	2	3
Skip school without an excuse . . .	1	2	3
Disobey parents' authority (to their face)	1	2	3
Take little things that do not belong to you (worth less than \$2) .	1	2	3
Buy or drink beer, wine, or liquor (Including drinking at home) . . .	1	2	3
Run away from home	1	2	3
To on purpose damage or destroy things that do not belong to you. .	1	2	3
Threatening kids for money	1	2	3
Beating up on kids who haven't done anything to you	1	2	3

¹Of the above items, the first 5 items and the seventh item were from the Nye Short (1957) scale and the sixth item was used by them but was dropped in the scaling procedure. The last two were added for the OFY study.

How often have your close friends done these things?
Circle the number of your answer.

	<u>Often</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Never</u>
Drive a car without a drivers' license	1	2	3
Skip school without an excuse . . .	1	2	3
Disobey parents' authority (to their face)	1	2	3
Take little things that do not belong to you (worth less than \$2)	1	2	3
Buy or drink beer, wine, or liquor (Including drinking at home)	1	2	3
To on purpose damage or destroy things that do not belong to you. .	1	2	3
Threatening kids for money	1	2	3
Beating up on kids who haven't done anything to you	1	2	3

What about yourself? For a boy your age, are you just about the way you want to be?

Just about the way I want to be.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Just about the oppo- site of the way I want to be.
-------------------------------------	---------------	--

Responses were coded as follows:

- 1-2 Strongly positive self-concept (associates very responsive)
- 3-4 Moderately positive self-concept
- 5-7 Negative self-concept (associates very un-responsive).

How many young people (under 21) do you know who have ever been in trouble with the police for other than a traffic violation?

None	1
1 or 2	2
3 to 5	3
6 to 10	4
More than 10 ...	5

How many young people (under 21) do you know who have ever been taken to Juvenile Court?

None	1
1 or 2	2
3 to 5	3
6 to 10	4
More than 10 ...	5

Now think of the three or four kids you know who sometimes get into trouble. Adults would say these kids are "wild" or maybe even "bad." If these kids were your close friends would they be just the way you want them to be?

Just about the way I want them to be.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Just about the oppo- site of the way I want them to be.
--	---------------	---

Responses were coded as follows:

1	Close affective tie
2	Moderate affective tie
3	Weak affective tie
4-7	Indifferent or negative affective tie.

Now think of the three or four kids you know who almost never get into trouble. Adults would probably say these kids are "OK" or "nice." If these kids were your friends would they be just about the way you would want them to be?

Just about the way I want them to be.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Just about the oppo- site of the way I want them to be.
--	---------------	---

Responses were coded as follows:

- 1 Close affective tie
- 2 Moderate affective tie
- 3 Weak affective tie
- 4-7 Indifferent or negative affective tie.

APPENDIX B

TABLES

Table 1

Test of Affective Ties Model Using Preference of
Associates and Closeness

Measure of Delinquency	High d Score	Low d Score	Gamma
Self Report	32.7% (36 of 110)	15.6% (14 of 90)	.45
Perception of peer behavior	42.7% (47 of 110)	32.2% (29 of 90)	.22
Police contact acquaintances	67.3% (74 of 110)	58.4% (52 of 89)	.19
Court referral acquaintances	62.7% (69 of 110)	54.4% (49 of 90)	.17
Teacher rating	55.5% (60 of 108)	39.3% (35 of 89)	.32
Police contact before 7/64	43.6% (48 of 110)	34.8% (31 of 89)	.18
Police contact 7/64 to 3/65	18.2% (20 of 110)	13.6% (12 of 88)	.17
Police contact 1965-67	35.8% (39 of 109)	23.6% (21 of 89)	.29

Note: Table indicates percent delinquent by each measure of delinquency.

Table 2

Test of Affective Ties Model Using Preference of
Associates, Closeness, and Visibility

Measure of Delinquency	High d Score	Low d Score	Gamma
Self Report	33.7% (35 of 104)	15.6% (15 of 96)	.47
Perception of peer behavior	43.3% (45 of 104)	32.3% (31 of 96)	.23
Police contact acquaintances	67.3% (70 of 104)	58.9% (56 of 95)	.18
Court referral acquaintances	63.4% (66 of 104)	54.2% (52 of 96)	.19
Teacher rating	55.9% (57 of 102)	40.0% (38 of 95)	.32
Police contact before 7/64	42.3% (44 of 104)	36.8% (35 of 95)	.11
Police contact 7/64 to 3/65	18.3% (19 of 104)	13.8% (13 of 94)	.16
Police contact 1965-67	36.9% (38 of 103)	24.2% (23 of 95)	.29

Note: Table indicates percent delinquent by each measure of delinquency.

Table 3

Test of Affective Ties Model Using Preference of
Associates, Closeness, and Responsiveness
of Associates

Measure of Delinquency	High d Score	Low d Score	Gamma
Self Report	34.7% (33 of 95)	16.2% (17 of 105)	.47
Perception of peer behavior	44.2% (42 of 95)	32.4% (34 of 105)	.25
Police contact acquaintances	69.5% (66 of 95)	57.7% (60 of 104)	.25
Court referral acquaintances	64.2% (61 of 95)	54.3% (57 of 105)	.20
Teacher rating	53.2% (50 of 94)	43.7% (45 of 103)	.19
Police contact before 7/64	44.7% (42 of 94)	35.2% (37 of 105)	.19
Police contact 7/64 to 3/65	16.8% (16 of 95)	15.5% (16 of 103)	.05
Police contact 1965-67	37.2% (35 of 94)	25.0% (26 of 104)	.28

Note: Table indicates percent delinquent by each measure of delinquency.

Table 4

Test of Complete Affective Ties Model

Measure of Delinquency	High d Score	Low d Score	Gamma
Self Report	34 % (34 of 100)	16 % (16 of 100)	.52
Perception of peer behavior	45 % (45 of 100)	31 % (31 of 100)	.29
Police contact acquaintances	66 % (66 of 100)	60.6% (60 of 99)	.12
Court referral acquaintances	63 % (63 of 100)	55 % (55 of 100)	.16
Teacher rating	54.5% (54 of 99)	41.8% (41 of 98)	.16
Police contact before 7/64	41 % (41 of 100)	38.4% (38 of 99)	.05
Police contact 7/64 to 3/65	17 % (17 of 100)	15.3% (15 of 98)	.06
Police contact 1965-67	36.4% (36 of 99)	25.2% (25 of 99)	.26

Note: Table indicates percent delinquent by each measure of delinquency.

Table 5

Association (Gamma) Between Delinquency Measures

Self Report	Percep- tion of Peer Behavior	Police Contact Acquain- tances	Court Referral Acquain- tances	Teacher Rating	Police Contact Before OFY	Police Contact During OFY	Police Contact After OFY
Self report	-	.44	.55	.21	.16	.08	.35
Perception of Peer Behavior	-	.18	.39	.45	.13	.23	.21
Police Contact Acquaintances		-	.79 ¹	.19	.32	.44	.37
Court Referral Acquaintances			-	.28	.27	.46	.37
Teacher Rating				-	.37	.41	.23
Police Contact Before OFY					-	.75 ¹	.43
Police Contact During OFY						-	.62
Police Contact After OFY							-

¹Similarity in operational indicators may have led to an abnormally high relationship.

Table 6
Percent Delinquent (Self Report) Controlling for Strength
of Ties to Each of Deviant Peers,
Conventional Peers, and
Parents

	Strength of Ties	
	Moderate or Strong	Weak or Nonexistent
Deviant Peers	26.6 (21 of 79)	24.0 (29 of 121)
Conventional Peers	19.3 (27 of 140)	38.3 (23 of 60)
Conventional Adults (Parents)	18.8 (24 of 128)	36.1 (26 of 72)

Table 7

Percent Delinquent (Self Report) Controlling for
Ties to Conventional Peers and Parents

		Ties to Conventional Peers	
		Moderate or Strong	Weak or Nonexistent
Ties to Parents	Moderate or Strong	16.8 (17 of 101)	25.9 (7 of 27)
	Weak or Nonexistent	25.6 (10 of 39)	48.5 (16 of 33)

Table 8

Percent Delinquent (Self Report) Controlling for
Ties to Deviant Peers and Parents

		Ties to Deviant Peers	
		Moderate or Strong	Weak or Nonexistent
Ties to Parents	Moderate or Strong	18.8 (9 of 48)	18.8 (15 of 80)
	Weak or Nonexistent	38.7 (12 of 31)	34.2 (14 of 41)

Table 9

Percent Delinquent (Self Report) Controlling for Ties to
Deviant Peers and Conventional Peers

		Ties to Deviant Peers	
		Moderate or Strong	Weak or Nonexistent
Ties to Conventional Peers	Moderate or Strong	22.2 (12 of 54)	17.4 (15 of 86)
	Weak or Nonexistent	36.0 (9 of 25)	40.0 (14 of 35)

Table 10

Delinquents (Self Report) Controlling for Ties to
Conventional Adults, Conventional Peers,
and Deviant Peers

		Weak or Non- existent Ties to Parents	Moderate or Strong Ties to Parents
Moderate or Strong Ties To Deviant Peers	Weak or Non- existent ties to Conventional Peers	58.3% (7 of 12)	15.4% (2 of 13)
	Moderate or Strong Ties to Conventional Peers	26.3% (5 of 19)	20 % (7 of 35)
Weak or Nonexistent Ties to Deviant Peers	Weak or Non- existent Ties to Conventional Peers	42.9% (9 of 21)	35.7% (5 of 14)
	Moderate or Strong Ties to Conventional Peers	25 % (5 of 20)	15.2% (10 of 66)

B29957